

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims have been amended to further clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention (see, for example, figures 6, 7 and 8, and pages 13-14 of the specification discussed below with respect to the rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C 112). New claims 51-58 have been added. These new claims correspond to claim 1 as originally filed and are also supported, for example, by the pages 13-14 of the specification.

The Examiner's rejection of claims is fully traversed below.

**Rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. 112**

In response to the Examiner's rejection of claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, the Examiner's attention is specifically directed to pages 13-14 of the specification reproduced below for the Examiner's convenience.

Referring next to Fig. 6, a SPECIFY CALCULATION screen 600 is depicted in accordance with one embodiment of the invention. The SPECIFY CALCULATION screen 600 is presented to a user in response to setting one of the access privileges indicators 406, 408 and 410 of the DEFINE PASSWORDS screen 400 to "Limited". As shown in Fig. 6, an input screen 602 is provided to allow a user to specify a calculation expression to limit access privileges of a selected password (e.g., "blue" of Fig. 5). In this example, access privileges are to be limited with respect to browsing operations. Accordingly, by specifying a calculation expression in the window 602, access privileges of a selected password can be limited with respect to browsing operations that can be performed on the records in the database.

To illustrate how a calculation expression may be specified, Fig. 7 depicts the SPECIFY CALCULATION screen 600 with an exemplary calculation expression 604 entered in the input screen 602. It should be noted that in this example, access privileges for a selected password are to be "Limited" with respect to editing operations that can be performed on the records in the database. The exemplary calculation expression 604 specifies that the field "Billing State" is equal to "CA" (California). In other words, the selected password is to be defined with editing access to a record only when the "Billing State" field of that record is equal to "CA".

It should be noted that windows 606, 608 and 610, as well as calculation pad 612 are provided to allow the user to more conveniently specify a calculation expression. For

example, various fields in the database are displayed in window 606. Thus, a user can be informed of the fields available that can be used to define a calculation expression. As another example, the window 608 informs the user of various operations and/or operators that may be available for specifying a calculation expression. It should be noted that a user may conveniently highlight and select an item displayed in windows 606, 608 and 610. Similarly, the calculation pad 612 may conveniently be used to specify various operators to construct a calculation expression. Accordingly, the user may utilize windows 606, 608, 610 and calculation pad 612 to conveniently specify long and complicated calculation expressions. As will be appreciated, in addition to fields, a calculation expression may also include other information; for example, state variables of database (e.g., date, time, number of records, etc.).

As noted above, a calculation expression can be specified to define a password with limited access privileges with respect to one or more operations in accordance with one embodiment of the invention. The specified calculation expression can, in turn, be evaluated to determine whether access should be granted to the password with respect to an operation that is requested to be performed on the database. Accordingly, the user or group of users associated with the password can be granted or denied access to the records of the database based on the calculation expression that is defined with respect to the requested operation. To illustrate, Fig. 8 depicts an exemplary file ACCOUNTS that includes records "ACC001", "ACC002", "ACC003" and "ACC004" displayed in a window 800. For example, these records can represent billing addresses of customers. A field "State" can indicate, for example, the state portion of the billing address. Recalling the exemplary calculation expression 604 of Fig. 7, given this expression, access to a record with respect to an operation would be granted only when the field "State" (Billing State) of that record is equal to "CA". Accordingly, using the calculation expression 604, access to records shown in Fig. 8 with respect to editing privileges, for example, would be limited to editing records "ACC001", "ACC002", and "ACC004". Thus, the user will not be granted editing privileges to record "ACC003" since the field "State" of this record is not equal to "CA". In this way, a calculation expression can be evaluated with respect to a record to determine whether to grant or deny access to each record (specification, pages 13-14).

As clearly stated in the specification with reference to Figure 7, the exemplary calculation expression 664 specifies that the field "billing state" is equal to "CA" (California) (Specification, page 14). Further, with reference to Figure 8, the specification states that "an exemplary file ACCOUNTS that includes records "ACC001," "ACC002," "ACC003," and "ACC004" is displayed in a window 800. The specification further states that the calculation expression 604 of Figure 7 (Billing state = "CA") can be used to control access to a record.

More particularly, the specification states: "Recalling the exemplary calculation expression 604 of Fig. 7, given this expression, access to a record with respect to an operation would be granted only when the field "State" (Billing State) of that record is equal to "CA". Accordingly, using the calculation expression 604, access to records shown in Fig. 8 with respect to editing privileges, for example, would be limited to editing records "ACC001", "ACC002", and "ACC004". Thus, the user will not be granted editing privileges to record "ACC003" since the field "State" of this record is not equal to "CA". In this way, a calculation expression can be evaluated with respect to a record to determine whether to grant or deny access to each record" (Specification, page 14).

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that, in view of the written description, it is abundantly clear that evaluating a calculation expression can comprise determining at least one value for at least one field of data stored in a database. The value can, for example, be the value of the field "State" in the record "ACC003" which is equal to "NY" and not equal to "CA".

Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that in view of the written specification, one skilled in the art will readily know that evaluating a calculation expression defined based on a field of a database can include determining the value of that field as stored in a record in a database. The Examiner's attention is directed, for example, to Microsoft Computer Dictionary, Fifth Edition, which defines a field as "a location in a record in which a particular type of data is stored."

In response to the rejection of claim 14, the Examiner's attention is directed to Microsoft Computer Dictionary, Fifth Edition, which generally defines a state, as a status, or the condition at a particular time of any of numerous elements of computing. Also, it should be noted that the specification states that a calculation expression can include state variables of a database (e.g., date, time, number of records) (Specification, page 13).

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph is clearly improper and should be withdrawn.

Rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. 103

The Applicant respectfully reiterates the arguments previously submitted. More particularly, contrary to the Examiner's assertion (Office Action, page 7 and 8), the Applicant respectfully submit that the Granted Permission Table of *Bapat et al.* does NOT teach or even remotely suggest a calculation expression for a database.

Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that *Bapat et al.* does not teach or suggest: evaluating a calculation expression for a plurality of records of a database based on at least one field of data of said database, wherein the evaluating comprises: (a) determining at least one value for at least one field of data stored for a first record of, (b) using the at least one value as input to the calculation expression to evaluate the calculation expression for the first record, and (c) determining a first result for said calculation expression based on the evaluation of the calculation expression for the first record, wherein the first result effectively indicates whether to grant access to the first record.

Additionally, it should be noted that the Examiner needs to at least show a motivation or suggestion for defining a calculation expression for a password used in a database in order to establish a prima facie case of obviousness that supports rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Instead, the Examiner has merely asserted that assigning or identifying a password is a conventional technique (Office Action, page 5).

Still further, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness that supports the rejection of claims 43 and 45-47 because the Examiner has failed to provide a motivation or suggestion for combining *Bapat et al.* and *Glasser et al.* (Office Action, page 12). Instead, the Examiner has merely stated that in order to create the permission table of *Glasser et al.*, obviously a Graphical User Interface has to be used.

Based on the foregoing, it is submitted that the claims are believed to be patentably distinct over the cited art of record. Additional limitations recited in the independent claims or the dependent claims are not further discussed as the limitations discussed above are sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention

from the cited art. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw all the rejections to the claims.

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,  
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



R. Mahboubian  
Reg. No. 44,890

P.O. Box 70250  
Oakland, CA 94612-0250  
(650) 961-8300

# **BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP**

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW

590 W. El Camino Real, Mountain View, CA 94040  
Telephone: (650) 961-8300 Facsimile: (650) 961-8301  
www.beycrllaw.com

## **FACSIMILE COVER SHEET**

March 9, 2006

Receiver: U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

TEL #:

FAX #: (571) 273-8300

Sender: Susan W. Xu for Ramin Mahboubian

Our Ref. No.: CLARP027

Re: Application No. 09/771,143

Pages Including Cover Sheet(s): (16)

### **MESSAGE:**

Dear Sir:

Please file the attached Amendment H Transmittal and Amendment H for the above referenced application.

---

#### **CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE**

The information contained in this facsimile (FAX) message is legally privileged and confidential information intended only for the use of the receiver or firm named above. If the reader of this message is not the intended receiver, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this FAX is strictly prohibited. If you have received this FAX in error, please immediately notify the sender at the telephone number provided above and return the original message to the sender at the address above via the United States Postal Service. Thank you.

---